



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,163	09/09/2004	Nicholas John Newcombe	056291-5180	2793

9629 7590 05/18/2007  
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

RAO, DEEPAK R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/18/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/507,163

Applicant(s)

NEWCOMBE ET AL.

Examiner

Deepak Rao

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 ~~is/are~~ are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 8-10 ~~is/are~~ are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7 and 11-21 ~~is/are~~ are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :20040909;  
20050217; 20050223; 20050224; 20050303; 20050304; 20050331; 20070215.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 4-7 and 11-21 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:


(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Breault et al., WO 02/20512 (published March 14, 2002). The reference generically teaches imidazolo-5-

Art Unit: 1624


yl-2-anilino-pyrimidine compounds having cell cycle inhibitory activity, see formula (I) in page 2 (depicted below for convenience):



(I)


wherein R<sup>2</sup> is a group R<sup>a</sup>-R<sup>b</sup>- wherein R<sup>b</sup> is -SO<sub>2</sub>-NH- and R<sup>a</sup> is as defined in page 3; the definition of variables R<sup>4</sup>, R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>6</sup> includes alkyl. The reference further discloses several compounds that fall within this subgenus. For example, the reference discloses the following compounds:

## Example 117



The instant claims exclude a subgenus disclosed in the reference, which includes the compound of Example 117 (depicted above), see the proviso statement. The instantly claimed compounds, however, include compounds, for example, wherein one of R<sup>4</sup>, R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>6</sup> is ethyl.

## Example 125



The instant claims recite that R<sup>6</sup> is C<sub>1-4</sub>alkyl, e.g., methyl, as compared to the reference disclosed compound which is unsubstituted at that position.

Therefore, the instantly claimed compounds differ from the reference compounds by a CH<sub>2</sub> group (or as H vs. CH<sub>3</sub>). It is well established that compounds that differ by a CH<sub>2</sub> group are structural homologs. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the reference compounds to prepare the structural homolog. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because such structurally homologous compounds are expected to possess similar properties. It has been held that compounds that are structurally homologous to prior art compounds are *prima facie* obvious, absent a showing of unexpected results. *In re Hass*, 60 USPQ 544 (CCPA 1944); *In re Henze*, 85 USPQ 261 (CCPA 1950).

**Note:** Applicant cannot rely on foreign priority based on GB 0205690.1 (filed March 9, 2002) to overcome the rejection because the priority document does not fully support the instant claims. Specifically, the priority document does not support the definitions provided in the instant claims for the variables: R<sup>4</sup> which includes C<sub>1</sub>alkyl (the instant claims recite that R<sup>4</sup> is C<sub>1-6</sub>alkyl as compared to C<sub>2-6</sub>alkyl) and R<sup>6</sup> which includes the term “ **halo** ”.

2. Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Breault et al., WO 02/20512 or US 6,969,714 (International filing date August 30, 2001).

The applied reference has a common assignee and/or inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: ~~(1)~~

Art Unit: 1624

(1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention “by another”; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

The reasons provided above apply here and are incorporated here by reference.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,969,714. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instantly claimed compounds are structurally analogous to the reference compounds. See the reasons provided above for the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

2. Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/507,162. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instantly claimed compounds are structurally analogous to reference compounds. The reference claims are also drawn to imidazolo-5-yl-2-anilino-pyrimidine compounds having cell cycle inhibitory activity. According to the reference claims, the imidazolyl group is unsubstituted at the 4-position and the instant analogous position the instant claims recite a substituent  $R^6$  which can be a methyl group. Therefore, the instantly claimed compounds differ from the reference compounds by having a methyl in place of H (i.e., H vs.  $CH_3$ ). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the reference compounds to prepare the structural homolog. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because such structurally homologous compounds are expected to possess similar properties.



This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/507,169. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instantly claimed compounds are structurally analogous to reference compounds. The reference claims are also drawn to imidazolo-5-yl-2-anilino-pyrimidine compounds having cell cycle inhibitory activity. According to the reference claims, the imidazolyl group is unsubstituted at the 4-position and the instant analogous position the instant claims recite a substituent R<sup>6</sup> which can be a methyl group. Therefore, the instantly claimed compounds differ from the reference compounds by having a methyl in place of H (i.e., H vs. CH<sub>3</sub>). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the reference compounds to prepare the structural homolog. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because such structurally homologous compounds are expected to possess similar properties.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 1-3 and 8-9 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/507,081. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct

Art Unit: 1624

from each other because the instantly claimed compounds are structurally analogous to reference compounds. The reference claims are also drawn to imidazolo-5-yl-2-anilino-pyrimidine compounds having cell cycle inhibitory activity. According to the reference claims, the imidazolyl group is unsubstituted at the 4-position and the instant analogous position the instant claims recite a substituent  $R^6$  which can be a methyl group. Therefore, the instantly claimed compounds differ from the reference compounds by having a methyl in place of H (i.e., H vs.  $CH_3$ ). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the reference compounds to prepare the structural homolog. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because such structurally homologous compounds are expected to possess similar properties.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Receipt is acknowledged of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on September 9, 2004; February 17, February 23-24, March 3-4, March 31, 2005; and February 15, 2007 and copies are enclosed herewith.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deepak Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 1624

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson, can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**Deepak Rao**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 1624**

May 11, 2007